

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 were pending in the application at the time of the advisory action. Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1 to 6 have been amended to further clarify that the process is performed via a resource server peer group as illustrated, for example, in Fig. 43A. Also, the operation of providing access has been further defined and is supported, for example, at least by Fig. 44. New Claims 7 to 10 are supported, for example, at least by Figs. 43B and 43C and the description thereof.

Claim 1 stands rejected 5 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,092,196 to Reiche (hereinafter, Reiche) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,970,904 to Rode (hereinafter, Rode).

In the Advisory Action dated October 31, 2006, the Examiner set out the basis for maintaining the rejections in part as:

. . . all the user performs is one request . . . and the authentication is still based on a single request.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of Claim 1. Applicants again thank the Examiner for the clarification on the basis of the rejection. However, Claim 1, as amended, makes it clear that a single request is involved and processed by the resource peer group and Claim 1 does not read on multiple interactions with an authentication server as cited in the rejection. As pointed out in response to the final office action, and incorporated herein by reference, the combination of references fails on multiple levels to provide any motivation for the recited request and the combinations fails to suggest the parts and actions associated with that request. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of Claim 1.

Applicants respectfully traverse the obviousness rejection of each of Claims 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6. With respect to Claims 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, the above comments are incorporated herein by reference. Each of Claims 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 recites at least one key to provide access to a resource on said data communications network; a resource identifier, a resource server peer group ID; and a randomized user ID. The cited sections of Reiche and the cited sections of Rode failed to teach the foregoing recited elements, as previously discussed. A *prima facie* obviousness rejection has not been made. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of each of Claims 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6.

With respect to Claims 7 to 10, these claims distinguish over the combination of references for at least the same reasons as the independent claim from which they depend. Further, no teaching or suggestion has been cited of a nested credential that specifies a resource delivery mechanism and use of that mechanism. Accordingly, each of Claims 7 to 10 distinguish over the combination for reasons in addition to those associated with the independent claim from which they depend. Applicants respectfully request allowance of Claims 7 to 10

Claims 1 to 10 remain in the application. Claims 1 to 6 have been amended. Claims 7 to 10 are new. For the foregoing reasons, Applicant(s) respectfully request allowance of all pending claims. If the Examiner has any questions relating to the above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned Attorney for Applicant(s).

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on December 14, 2006

Respectfully submitted,



Forrest Gunnison
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 32,899
Tel.: (831) 655-0880



Attorney for Applicant(s)

December 14, 2006

Date of Signature